1 BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 2 STATE OF WASHINGTON 3 IN THE MATTER OF WILLIAM G. BURLESON, 4 Appellant, PCHB No. 81-72 5 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, v. 6 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION AND ORDER 7 CONTROL AUTHORITY, 8 Respondent. 9 10 This matter, the appeal of two \$250 civil penalties for outdoor

This matter, the appeal of two \$250 civil penalties for outdoor burning allegedly in violation of Regulation I of the Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Authority (PSAPCA) Article 8, Section 8.02 and 8.05 came on for hearing before the Pollution Control Hearings Board at Tacoma, Washington on September 3, 1981. William A. Harrison, an administrative law judge, presided. Members Nat W. Washington and Gayle Rothrock served for and as the Board.

Appellant appeared and respresented himself. Respondent appeared through its attorney, Keith D. McGoffin. Court reporter Kim Otis

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

recorded the proceedings. Respondent elected a formal hearing pursuant to RCW 43.21B.230.

Witnesses were sworn and testified, exhibits were examined and arguments were heard. From what was heard and examined the Pollution Control Hearings Board makes these

FINDINGS OF FACT

T

Respondent has filed with this Board a certified copy of its Regulation I, of which we take official notice. It contains respondent's regulations and amendments thereto, pursuant to RCW 43.21B.

ΙI

On March 2, 1981, the appellant caused or allowed an outdoor fire to be ignited on his residential and farm property near Kent, Washington in King County Fire District No. 37, without benefit of a fire permit. The fire was supposed to dispose of materials from cleared land and some wooden chicken cages no longer needed in the appellant's poultry farming operation. The fire was ignited in the late afternoon by an occasional employee of appellant. The employee ignited the fire without appellant's knowledge under the mistaken belief that appellant had already obtained a fire permit.

III

The fire measured up to 20 feet by 30 feet at the base and 7 feet high at the piled-up peak. It contained stumps, limbs, branches and other vegetation. Up to 10% of the contents were chicken cages, scrap

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

lumber, six empty oil cans, chicken feathers, pieces of metal from feeding troughs, an old chair, and a container described as a 50-gallon drum, which constitute prohibited materials for an open land clearing burn.

IV

Shortly after the brush pile was ignited, someone reported the fire to the Kent Fire Department, the contract service provider for Fire District No. 37. Kent Fire Department personnel came to the site, talked with the man who ignited the fire, ascertained there was no valid fire permit, talked with the property owner, and indicated the firefighters and equipment were ready to extinguish the fire. Out of apparent skepticism about municipal firefighting methods, appellant, Burleson, prevented firefighters from entering his property. After the spectre of sheriff deputies' presence was raised by Kent firefighters, appellant permitted entrance to his property and extinguishment of the sizeable fire with 500 gallons of water from a fire engine and 1250 gallons of water from a tanker.

V

Kent firefighters contacted PSAPCA, whose area inspector went to the fire station and later, the residence at the fire site. Finding no one at home the inspector left three notices of violation of air quality regulations for opening burning. Subsequently two Notices and Orders of Civil Penalty (Nos. 5048 and 5060) of respondent agency, each imposing a \$250 penalty, were served on appellant, citing violations of Regulation I, Article 8, Section 8.02 and 8.05.

6'

1

2 3 4

5

7 :

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

Appellant had supervised and ignited a large number of outdoor land clearing fires at the site in the last 30 years. For the past decade appellant had always obtained fire permits from the Kent Fire Department prior to causing or allowing outdoor burning on his property. In this instance appellant had only conversed in general terms with his occasional employee about a fire permit for the subject fire.

VII

After the fire was extinguished, appellant sought and obtained a fire permit from the Kent Fire Department. He then burned the balance of the stumps and natural vegetation without incident.

VIII

Any Conclusion of Law which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings the Board comes to these

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ι

The Board has jurisdiction over these matters and these persons under RCW 70.94.740, RCW 43.21B, and PSAPCA Regulation I, Article 3 and Article 8.

II

Appellant, William G. Burleson through his agent/employee, did allow an outdoor land clearing fire with some prohibited materials therein to burn on his property without benefit of a fire permit, in

of stumps and natural vegetation, as delineated and classified in Regulation I. Appellant did not violate Regulation I, Article 8, Section 8.05. Appellant has no record of any prior violation of respondent's regulations. For these reasons the civil penalties should be mitigated. IV	1	violation of respondent's Regulation I, Article 8, Section 8.02(3)
The subject fire was a land clearing fire, composed predominant of stumps and natural vegetation, as delineated and classified in Regulation I. Appellant did not violate Regulation I, Article 8, Section 8.05. Appellant has no record of any prior violation of respondent's regulations. For these reasons the civil penalties should be mitigated. IV Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law shereby adopted as such. From these Conclusions the Board enters this 19 20 21 22 23 24	2	and (5).
of stumps and natural vegetation, as delineated and classified in Regulation I. Appellant did not violate Regulation I, Article 8, Section 8.05. Appellant has no record of any prior violation of respondent's regulations. For these reasons the civil penalties should be mitigated. IV Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law hereby adopted as such. From these Conclusions the Board enters this 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	3	III
Regulation I. Appellant did not violate Regulation I, Article 8, Section 8.05. Appellant has no record of any prior violation of respondent's regulations. For these reasons the civil penalties should be mitigated. IV Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law: hereby adopted as such. From these Conclusions the Board enters this From these Conclusions the Board enters this 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	4	The subject fire was a land clearing fire, composed predominantly
Section 8.05. Appellant has no record of any prior violation of respondent's regulations. For these reasons the civil penalties should be mitigated. IV Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law hereby adopted as such. From these Conclusions the Board enters this From these Conclusions the Board enters this 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	5	of stumps and natural vegetation, as delineated and classified in
respondent's regulations. For these reasons the civil penalties should be mitigated. IV Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law hereby adopted as such. From these Conclusions the Board enters this 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	6	Regulation I. Appellant did not violate Regulation I, Article 8,
should be mitigated. IV Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law hereby adopted as such. From these Conclusions the Board enters this 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	7	Section 8.05. Appellant has no record of any prior violation of
10 Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law shereby adopted as such. 13 From these Conclusions the Board enters this 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	8	respondent's regulations. For these reasons the civil penalties
Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law hereby adopted as such. From these Conclusions the Board enters this	9	should be mitigated.
hereby adopted as such. From these Conclusions the Board enters this From the	10	IV
From these Conclusions the Board enters this 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	11	Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law is
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	12	hereby adopted as such.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	13	From these Conclusions the Board enters this
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	14	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	15	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	16	
19 20 21 22 23 24	17	
20 21 22 23 24	18	
21 22 23 24	19	
22 23 24	20	
23 24	21	
24	22	
	23	
25	24	
•	25	•

ORDER

The Notice and Order of Civil Penalty No. 5048 is affirmed, provided however, that \$50 is suspended on condition appellant not violate respondent's regulations for a period of 18 months from the date of appellant's receipt of this Order. Notice and Order of Civil Penalty No. 5060 is hereby vacated.

DONE this $\frac{10^{14}}{2}$ day of September, 1981.

POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD

GAYLE ROTHROCK, Member

May M. Washington, Chairman